

REMARKS

This is a Submission filed with the attached Request for Continued Examination. Please reconsider the claims pending in the application for reasons discussed herein.

In the advisory action dated January 20, 2003, the Examiner maintained his rejection of claims 1-17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Hoffman*.

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. *Hoffman* discloses a passive infrared detector having two light sensors onto which radiation is focused by lens segments, preferably Fresnel lenses. Each sensor has reflectors for directing additional radiation onto the sensor. Applicants submit that if the lens of the present invention is equated to the whole of the Fresnel lens used by *Hoffman*, then *Hoffman* does not satisfy the first part of claim 1 requiring a "single focused image". Alternatively, if the lens of the present invention is equated to one lens segment of *Hoffman*, then *Hoffman*'s reflector does not reflect onto the detector radiation "entering the lens" from outside the first field of view. Rather, the reflectors of *Hoffman* reflect onto the sensors radiation which has passed through other lens segments. Moreover, it would not be obvious to replace either or both of the sensors of *Hoffman* by a detector array and nor would this result in the claimed invention. An array is usually used when an image is required. The addition of reflectors directing extra radiation onto the array would distort the image and, therefore, is not an obvious step. Furthermore, if a detector array was substituted in *Hoffman*'s arrangement, the result would not provide a "single image..." as required by claim 1.

Moreover, *Hoffman* is concerned with making the field of view as large as possible through the use of reflectors. However, there is no suggestion to provide any kind of spatial information relating to an event. Events within a scene are simply detected or not. The ability to distinguish the first and second field of views is particularly advantageous since the second field of view can be used for test purposes with no danger of the "test" being mistaken for an alarm inducing event. The specification further provides that a two dimensional detector array such as a square or rectangular array may be used to distinguish the field of views. Therefore, *Hoffman* does not teach, show, or suggest a detector array and a lens arranged to define a first field of view of the apparatus and to provide a single focussed image of a distant scene

on the array; a reflector arranged between a plane of the array and a plane of the lens to define a second field of view which extends beyond the first field of view and to reflect onto the detector array radiation entering the lens from outside the first field of view; and one or more processors for distinguishing events in the second field of view from those in the first field of view, as recited in claim 1 and claims depending therefrom. Additionally, *Hoffman* does not teach, show, or suggest a two dimensional detector array and a lens arranged to define a first field of view of the apparatus and to provide a single focused image of a distant scene on the array, as recited in new claim 29. Consequently, Applicants believe claims 1-32 are in condition for allowance and respectfully requests allowance of the same.

Claims 18, 20-22 and 24-25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Hofmann* in view of *Wiemeyer*, U.S. Patent No. 5,617,077. Claims 18, 20-22 and 24-25 depend, either directly or indirectly, from claim 1. As discussed above, Applicants believe claim 1 is in condition for allowance. Therefore, Applicants also believe claims 18, 20-22 and 24-25 are in condition for allowance and respectfully requests allowance of the same.

Claims 23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Hofmann* in view of *Rogers*, U.S. Patent No. 6,118,852.

Claim 23 depends indirectly from claim 1. As discussed above, Applicants believe claim 1 is in condition for allowance. Therefore, Applicants also believe claim 23 is in condition for allowance and respectfully requests allowance of the same.

Claims 26-28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Hofmann* in view of *Chipper*, U.S. Patent No. 5,852,516.

Claims 26-28 depend indirectly from claim 1. As discussed above, Applicants believe claim 1 is in condition for allowance. Therefore, Applicants also believe claims 26-28 are in condition for allowance and respectfully requests allowance of the same.

Conclusion

In conclusion, the references cited by the Examiner, neither alone nor in combination, teach, show, or suggest the apparatus of the present invention. Having addressed all issues set out in the office action, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully requests that the same be allowed.

Respectfully submitted,



William B. Patterson
Registration No. 34,102
MOSER, PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, L.L.P.
3040 Post Oak Blvd., Suite 1500
Houston, TX 77056
Telephone: (713) 623-4844
Facsimile: (713) 623-4846
Attorney for Applicants